

**SACRAMENTO RIVER CONSERVATION AREA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MINUTES**

February 22, 2001
4:00 p.m.

Enloe Conference Center
Chico, Ca.

Chair Denny Bungarz called the meeting of the Sacramento River Conservation Area to order at 4:05 p.m. at the above location. It was determined that there was a quorum of (9) voting members present.

County	Public Interest	Landowner	Agency
Butte	Jane Dolan	Shirley Lewis	
Colusa	Doug White	(Ben Carter)	
Glenn	Denny Bungarz	(Jason Larrabee)	
Shasta	Glenn Hawes	(Dan Gover)	
Sutter	Dan Silva	(Russell Young)	
Tehama	Bill Borrer	(Brendon Flynn)	
Yolo	(Lynnel Pollock) Tom Stallard	Marc Faye	
Resources Agency			Mel Dodgin
Cal DFG			Diana Jacobs
State Reclamation Board			Pete Rabbon
USF&WS			Dan Castleberry
US COE			Mark Charlton
DWR			Dwight Russell
Bureau of Reclamation			Laura Allen

Names listed in parentheses represent absences

Also present, an estimated audience of 30 interested persons

Manager Burt Bundy

Assistant Pat Brown, Recording Secretary

Tim Ramirez, Resources Agency

1. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INTRODUCTIONS – Ramon Vega, NWR, noted that as of March 1 Packer Lake will be open to the public for fishing. Tom Evans from Family Water Alliance discussed several items that had been brought to the Board some time ago and had been referred to the TAC and/or sub-committee to be addressed. They felt there needed to be a response concerning the status of these issues. The Manager agreed to draft a response addressing those concerns. Burt also requested another item be included that was not listed on the agenda – the determination of use of proceeds upon dissolution of the NPO – it was agreed it would be discussed after the Activities Updates. Chairman Bungarz suggested that the public comment line be placed after the adoption of minutes on future agendas.
2. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES FOR ADOPTION – Dan Silva moved, seconded by Bill Borrer, to approve the January 18, 2001 minutes. Motion passed by unanimous vote of the Board.

3. **POLICY ACTIONS** - **County Review Process** – After reading the draft language it was suggested by John Merz, SRPT, that instead of *at the next SRCA Board meeting...* it should read *at a subsequent SRCA Board meeting...* It was agreed to hold this item over to the next Board meeting because of the absence of some of the Board members. An issue was raised concerning the ability of a member to grant voting power to another member and it was noted the by-laws do not allow for this. **Executive Committee** – the formation of this committee is authorized in the by-laws and its responsibilities would include assisting in preparing Board agendas, review of petty cash disbursements, coordinating project visits, and advising the Manager in administrative matters. The make-up of the committee would be: Chairman, Vice Chair, Secretary/Treasurer, Immediate past Chair, 1 member of the Landowner group, 1 member of the Public Interest Group, and 1 Ex-Officio member. A question was raised as to whether or not the group could vote or not? It was determined its function would be advisory. It was moved by Tom Stallard, seconded by Doug White, that they move forward with the establishment of the committee. Motion passed by unanimous vote of the Board. **Placing Items on the Agenda** – *requests to place an item on the agenda must be presented to the Manager or the Chairman at least two weeks prior to the scheduled Board meeting. The Chairman will confer with the Manager as to the makeup of the agenda, and determine the items to be scheduled. The Manager will mail out the agenda to the Board at least 10 days prior to the Board meeting.* There was consensus of the board to accept this language. **Election of Officers** – moved by Bill Borrer, seconded by Glenn Hawes, to set June, 2001 as the month for election of SRCA Board officers. Motion passed by unanimous vote of the Board. **Petty Cash Fund** – Request was made by the Manager to establish a petty cash fund not to exceed \$200.00. The account would be funded and reimbursed through the administrative budget at CSU. It was determined that this should be a checking account rather than a cash fund. Glenn Hawes moved, seconded by Bill Borrer, to establish a petty cash fund in the amount of \$200.00 with the Manager, Secretary/Treasurer, and Chairman as signers on the account. Motion carried by unanimous vote of the Board.
4. **MANAGER’S REPORT** - Burt Bundy reported on a meeting with DWR and Tehama County Public Works to discuss alternatives in funding for some rockwork that is needed at Woodson Bridge. He is open to any ideas or suggestions. On February 27 there will be a meeting in Hamilton City at 8:30 a.m. to discuss the progress on efforts by the COE, The Reclamation Board, TNC, and others. It was noted that updates and coordination of efforts are extremely important and need to be addressed at this meeting. Burt also discussed a tour of the river he took recently with Wildlife Conservation Board. They looked at a project at Moulton Weir which consists of approximately 106 acres. They had hoped it would re-vegetate naturally but it has not and they are working on a plan to restore that area. It has been pulled off the WCB agenda for February because of some concerns expressed by local landowners. There will be a meeting sometime in March to provide an opportunity for public input on this project. Burt also reported on another tour in the Tisdale Weir area with Lu Hintz, Ben Carter, Dick Akin, and others. Burt noted that the Comp. Study is gearing up and advised the group that attention needs to be paid and input in the process is very important.
5. **TAC REPORT** - Dan Keppen reported on the February 15th meeting. He discussed the gravel bar intrusion at the location of the M&T/Llano Seco pumps and City of Chico outfall. They are still looking at CALFED funding but nothing has been finalized as yet. Tim Ramirez, Resources Agency, advised the Board that all the contracts have been held up; however, this one has been moved to the top of the list. The draft definition on Reach 1 is in its preliminary stages – it was decided to hold the next TAC meeting in Red Bluff since that was more appropriate for Reach 1.

There was a question raised at the TAC on the draft IRZ definition for Reach 4 – did it exclude the bypass area and should there be language that states that? Pete noted that the Reclamation Board does spend millions removing silt from that area. It was decided that the definition was not ready for approval and would be placed on the agenda for the next Board meeting.

Dan noted that the January meeting in Meridian showed a real fear of setback levees by the stakeholders in Reach 4. Dan reported on the presentation by Tom Ellis on several issues that were of concern to him as a landowner including debris in the river and language referring to setback levees in the Handbook. Dan also noted there is some real confusion on the Inner River Zone versus the Conservation Area.

Mr. Cecil, a property owner in Grimes, had asked for something in writing from both the COE and The Reclamation Board assuring him there were no plans to take his property to build a levee. He had received a response from The Reclamation Board only. Mark Charlton from the COE agreed to send a letter advising him there are no active proposals for setback levees.

Tom Evans repeated the FWA request to take the conservation area out of Reach 4 and expressed concern over language in the Handbook, which refers to 50,000 acres eligible for conversion to habitat. It was agreed to place the discussion of the conservation area in Reach 4 on the next agenda.

Doug White also expressed the negative feelings on the part of stakeholders in Reach 4. Discussion followed which emphasized the need to continue holding meetings, which allow for more public input and education. Pete Rabbon also stressed the importance of education and offered his services for future meetings in Reach 4. It was noted that the Comp. Study will be holding meetings in the area and that the SRCA could assist with outreach and work with them to coordinate meetings. It was agreed they should work as co-sponsors while noting the clear differences between the two. A handout was suggested that showed the Inner River Zone versus the Conservation Area to help reduce the confusion. The Split tail was mentioned as another cause for concern and fear in the Reach 4 area.

6. **AGENCY UPDATES** – Mark Charlton, COE, discussed several meetings held or to be held including The Feather River and Yuba River Reach Flood Control stakeholders meeting scheduled for March 29 in Yuba City from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and the Sacramento River Environmental stakeholders meeting scheduled for March 22 in Chico from 1-4 p.m. (Locations TBD). He also reported on the first information paper which will be out in the next couple of weeks. The Comp. Study Team will report on its findings at the next SRCA Board meeting. They will also be presenting the findings to stakeholders for responses before the final report.

Diana Jacobs introduced Sam Lawson, TNC, who updated the Board on land acquisition south of Hamilton City. He indicated Glenn County and The Reclamation Board have both sent letters of support. The property is contiguous to other conservancy owned land and would leave one small portion in private ownership. They have worked with the landowners and the Hamilton City Community Service District to agree on ecosystem restoration and flood damage reduction. John Merz, SRPT, read from a letter submitted to Al Wright, Executive Director of the Wildlife Conservation Board, indicating his concerns about this acquisition, which is on the 2/23 WCB agenda.

Barney Flynn, Sacramento River Partners, discussed a project for restoration of riparian habitat on Cottonwood Creek in Shasta County. The SRP were low bidders on this project, which pre-dates the SRCA. They will be holding a meeting with adjacent landowners and will have a presentation to bring before the next TAC meeting.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** – Pete offered to make a presentation to the Board concerning past land condemnations by The Board of Reclamation as the question of “eminent domain” has been of great concern to stakeholders. This report will be placed on the agenda for the April Board Meeting.

A landowner in the audience stated that maps showing which lands were held by which agencies, preferably by county, would be helpful.

Non-Profit Corporation/Disposition of Assets - Burt explained that application for tax-exempt status requires the naming of one or more nonprofit, nonpolitical entities to receive assets (after payment of, or provisions for, payment of all debts and liabilities) of the SRCA upon its dissolution. After discussion, Tom Stallard moved, seconded by Glenn Hawes, to name the California Wildlife Foundation as the beneficiary.

8. **FUTURE MEETINGS** -

The next TAC meeting will be held on March 22nd in Red Bluff, at 10:00 a.m.

The next SRCA Board meeting will be held on March 29th at the Willows City Hall, Willows, at 4:00 p.m.

The dates were set as follows for future Board meetings: April 26th, May 24th, June 28th, and July 26th. (Locations to be determined)

Meeting adjourned: 6:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Patricia Brown
Recording Secretary